

3
1-9-16

London Problems

X 144

142: ^{MHH} ^{Clifford} ~~Niger-Nike~~ split over VN in 1965
COM Boston - Melroe remittances

150 ~~Ann~~ 1974 ~~East~~ intermediate VN
+ disturb

1980 recon Plan for Reagan (HSC? ASW?)

125 "Debate balance" appears LNW, LSR? (HAK)

so. "Massive retal" (at least ^{US} than Fc)

127
HAK

"Will" = "low and high not
will you accept?"
(1956-R-290?)

|| would be only don't
|| but not SC unhappily?

1957 - HAK complete study, book and month?

Smith R appears completion, as

Oct 8 - Spent

(CBM)

|| and last!

Statute becoming "debate balance"

129 Good books. Smith

RAW

the debate (I don't believe in it)

JFR - Rebels soft on Cur (HAC is renewal)

1961-
was in JFE campaign - for USMC

no "Gap" ~~Feb~~ 1961 BUT

151 ^{SU} frontiers expansion

Sum 1974 COM "The Quest for Defense"

WG:

Nitpe margins for SALT delegation.

N ~~near~~
1973 Aug 8-9

Letter sent from SecDef (from C14: ¹⁹⁷³)

News 76 - GPD II

(debate: Carter vs. Ford)

influence on both

(Rohrer was back involved for Dan Piro

(Chas. Long, Kenneth Willson

(Monsieur, Trans B

debate in 1976 - Was CW over?

= RISC-~~68~~

Nitpe: correlation forms thing in SU direction

Contract for model Recovery.

165 SU not setting for win out (out + O-L?)

but not FS, either

165

SU "come back & win" (like USAF?) (SU = AW 165

166 Ppno: like Poles in Europe's shadow

SU blackmail (in face of SU FS threat)

"like US/SU in 162"

(if SU thought ~~that~~ ~~it~~ was fools.)

see 261 - ~~revenue~~
166 HAR - ~~improvement~~ 1974-75 note

Q: 167 CF - Schles from '74 (N)

FY 76 no perceived superiority (MT) vs. essential equivalence
(Aug 75) new rules, 3 new divisions

no great FS position, just US "superiority"
is needed, +CF is equal of "world" (what?)

neutrality, non-aligned, overconfidence of SU

168 - ~~and~~ and US out of Europe

Q 168 builds

X (169) C-T in 1978 from 14, 1977 (Center alone to come in)
- some result?

+ Berlin '61 US SUPERIORITY (?)

(yes, it existed: but

critical to entire, SU blackmail?

X OR even "essential equiv." enough to
make K back down, or if not, DEF?

see York

Was US think of FS critical - compared to K think
of and street?

176 Wanda us.

Schles: Controversy over race (CF/ and CW).

Feb 1977 Trust. & Ex. Pol. (Hollnacker)

178 "trace" with SU = treason.

US retreat from world power isolationism effort (milit.)

CPD & CDEY about end of Carter. (Philato)
us. Wanda
(Schles for Sec Def); Harold Brown as compromise

CPD right after Carter writing
SU drive for dominion
unparalleled int. linkages
world domination

(Was Wanda win really "imperial"
(or purely "imperial" empire,
not Court)

198

Q
X

202 SU "improving" after a FS exchange!

(would it survive?!)

= "correction/punish"

2 R, 1 US!

see

us. HAK!

Rumors: SU "war-fight" (=D-L) us.

205 - sup.

CF 259

236

not including

205

Can I say, "beliefs" in "superiority" is meaningless
in foreign affairs?

Belief of "world"

US allies

SU

(Parker { or by USC?
or by belief of SU in USC belief?

Does it decide Berlin & C-II?

Claim that SU is "driving toward all-out war
superiority" (is crisis?)

(Not, FS!

But Gorbachev showed not only US "sub."

but intends to strike!

202 CW liberal (me) Land-lies on SU threat

(tell ^{but} '61? - then, dispute, then
Gorbachev

Johnson
H³

ARM (Parker, Wolfgang
'then B!)

(but, NATO threat)

Q 211 coalition

1977-78: Concessions to CPD,
"compromise, record."

→ FALL OF SHAW, early 79

What happened to firing Center?

192- campaign

235 "Chin & arms" - fragment

(attempt to avoid a over the
presidency (Horne, ^{OFFER} 280) which
he got!) (1st-Kennedy?)

236 Dec-12 ¹⁹⁷⁹ before Office
NATO-P-II?

JC Business Council

SO building?

model 19X report deployment

(after N-bomb) (RFEF)

from 23, 1980

(date?)

early 79 (?) Shock falls

date!

End - hostage crisis

238 "fall of from" 1979 Washington same year
("indirect exposure")

(240)

SY/Office revised as important

[a purpose of Bg/Center shift, before hostage crisis
+ Office - both promoted of Bg/Center/Rockefeller?!
[after fall of Shah = "loss of China"?!]

from early 1979!

DE quoting SAC 2-23-80

241 Ehta is not monolithic - but "dominant" repeated
again (except Center last 2 years?)

Carter, like JFK in '61, didn't challenge &
reject Soviet bid CW:

1962 Cuba-I

Berlin
VN
Mun (Kiss.)

July 77 246 PRY-10 assem: Soviet (D-52) N12A-MM weapons
CM, MX

Aug: JC: SU buildup was "a great danger" Wg?
"Surprising" →

Sept 77 MX \$60-70B' FS, C-E
vs. coercion

Aug ~~77~~ 77 RPO for Persian Gulf

CW option: 252 SU control West ^{Europe}
vs. US control: NATO
(what if Euro. withdrawal?!

[Real SU seek pol/dip advantage with the buildup?
Compared to K?
& compared to JFK/US? (Anp.)

(255)

CPO - SU was moving toward crest. FS, to use as US did
in '50s + '62' - to end of world domination (and, West Eur)
(after FS, and even after US retreats (?)
SU would have more MT than France!
could control US (NO) (disrupt numbers, efforts!)

256 SU would replace US of EU thanks
(+ make its own?) → where did it then
used then?

256 Could Helge have believed what he said?
Kind for, + effort of, EC/Strat. group
(as in Helge's:)

Schmidt

(Was this amend + (c) effort
in Korea, Berlin, C-II? (V&?))
(vs. McG B — "no effort" 10.

(I say: great for + claim of group did reduce
det (at least "involved")
+ many wonderful

(My group: main function of SU Threat / US new approach
was to mean US Agency in
West Europe (original US role, essential)

What would
UK have done
20's. or France?

(also: EU attitude Europe,
(expansion? or) mountain of US enforce defence to
Agency in form colonial TW
(rather than enter?) independence (best,
or 2) Can influence retained)

257 SU - 70's — the same?

// (did SU and EU? but good to define US-EU:
by kind of notable or use?

[not in 1961-62] [but ^{4x} not inquired...]

What if but the FS threat (an "moral" —
in face of huge 2nd-strike cap on but?)

With can be confident in using FU threat
— yet it has more cost ("moral FS") for launch!

But loss of it offered US more in
TW in 1950's-1960's:

But if could SU use it in 1970's-80's?

Now, it would it — not so cost!

|| Rather from "Baltic/Carina" (SUNs) to
|| defend!

Kaliningrad, western Ukraine,

US: Baltics; eastern Ukraine?

Spiral As the kernel! years, long.
(Spiral has defined, settled)

258 (What will SAGT-2 promise? (It should have MX, ALCM,
Friedt; a new ex-Bow

Perry? ^{Brown} "MAY would be unbearable"

1979 = Shen B: yes! get will of it!
not MX! (+ D-5i)

CF don't demand CBMs, just France!

Alternative:

What if I (RAND: No) had gone
if USA were
sponsored!

for SLBMs-only — give up MM
after Sept. 1961

(And for 10,000 SUICBMs,
all 60 MT/100 MT

+ IRBMs

So what? (US NFC; and
Human the area
+ sub)

(after C-II? (JFK killed soon!))

S107-62 and -63

ban missile tests

ICBMs, MRBMs, the area ((CTB))

get
(K to agree
to inspection

US out,
Horus up,

(Control de?)

SU out

"

"Debate" on SALT-II was not helpful.

266: seeks accommodation with Right (CPD)
despite lack of middle ground

BHO = Carter: Come in on abolition, using CW-I; out on CW-II
goes out on CW-III

(bellend of: Cold Warrior? + ~~DR~~ R. Pearson)
in CW?

260 "Modem" "Armed" = 28/6 as in 1929-80

= CF, improving (vs. "Arms"
"signature")

which VEK "Magical"

in 1961 (Vainu)

(A demol: wrong of:

[Europe; Golan;

(New Western)

(using plan ^{via. FU on 8/21} war have

on 1) should should for Europe

2) should

263 N ^{HAE} (Bond/Bell?)

actually have relatively good are being

N note FU
(+ Alert = '69:)

but not "US sub")

(as direct FU think

us SC forces:

Berlin, India

as long

unusual)

in SOTU for 13, 1980

(as in about, of for '72 or earlier in '79)

to 229 Brown 3-12-79 Carter document

look can think to

data 2d use to the on FU;

or even, FU (SC direct to the us FU in UN?) on Mull, hang, Kilger,
HK-11

1-7-6

Benefit/advantage of CW/Russian trade/US FS position
(Washington, "superior"
CC-

is not only to MIC

or is (CW) down side

but to: US Recovery in West Europe + new, East
Middle East (contin)
+ TW

(Russia, Ukraine
Russia
Central Asia)

"reform, retreat, retreat" Reform + Recovery
(Would not only in trade/finance,

i-16-16

to the CPO-III

~~was~~ tried to CPO-II?

- ~~Smiler~~?! (New-Cons
Korea?)

vs. any agreement (Korea?) with SU/Russians?
are from!

(Hope: all our agreements were to the good —
highly appreciated by Russians —
our contact was not very important,
vs. CW! ~~was~~

263) ^{SU} Phil Agreement invasion army and (foreign)
240 purpose on 9-11? (yes!)
on Korean invasion
(TG + Primer!) (not, Int!)
on Phil Hansen on 1973 —
(“Roadheads”; C-II:)

(were all of these promoted, encouraged, promoted
(or “inspired,” false flag? now, under 9-11? Roadheads
as well as exploited (recommended))

263

Johnson and
(Korea?)

TR

1-10-10

Controlled proposed
autonomous into

(stability)

Substance of our control (SALT-III) Real

Section
265

already been Acquired (SALT-II, so regional

but potential control, of regional
water (us-CW)

until SOTU 80, Control abandoned (SALT-II...)

(before Range : until 1975...

no negotiations, in 1981, 82, 83, 84, 85, ...
?

1-16-16

Canter's ^{mobile} MX was

1. A premise that it was needed or desired
at Range I distance

2. Short ICBM unhindered in 1977 (or 1980's)
was very deteriorating, high risk of SU proprio
attack

3. i.e. CV concept of SU (dis + unhindered:
proprio)

(found the real weakness
stomach of US.)

4. Current in: CF, D-L, FS, superiority

5. Support for (CDD) views:

i) Mobile usable, unhindered attack.

superiority is achievable, of either side

ii) SU was moving for it, we would not do it base

iii) would give SU world domination it

"appeal, unhindered,

D-L - to unhindered

at least,

preparation as base

and, known distinction then (high likelihood of) moving FS

6. No argument (in MT) was acceptable
(in ICBMs)

1977-81

CW-II: a failure for democracy (Liberals, Reagan years?)

autonomous
Eke, in
contrast (?)
to CPD-I:

public manipulated (f CPD, ~~rather~~ ~~manipulated~~)

Wt + Congress contributed to (arrogant)

public bias

("Team B")

CIA circled

265

anti-SALT-II

(anti-Warlike move. (+ Sarason?))

anti-Persona

anti-abortion

- gay

- ERA

- gun control

- Soviet threat

Spending → popular (misinformation)

vs. Brown's "referenda"

"Poker on right wing frontals"
Hills to Carter 9-16-79

24 [Alternative name chosen:

CANDOR on (refers to...)

i) Russ/TN/D-2/CF, "disproving"
Kare Winters

(US: FU, ES: Carol Ann, officer?)

(Empire? Va.? Ha (V.N.))

Interference?

?

- Relations with other states could reflect
human rights/dictatorship but not
be determined by them

(C's human rights record against
SU? ... SACR-II?)

- Vs. "SU Front" (but: US Regime)

- Plan-Break

(Counter-protection)

- "Enemies" / Hitler

(not SU...)

TR 75-76 Chuck Hanks (Ford?)

Chuck Hanks to Russ in 1976: *

John Cloud "discovered" 2600 SU trucks in Cuba

in Sept. 79 (Barry Melton? 80?) (vs. SACR-II
supports "Carter Doctrine" after Black March 79

Hyd. 267 3m center-left (Center) is less likely
to ally with Left ("progressives") than
center-right (neo-cons, CPD) is to ally with Right

center-left needs (unavoidable) accommodation
with center-right/Right coalition
Center, BHO
(Clinton?)

at ECX12)
(Halliburton: "Krugman and I thought down toward the
center (Lanning, 9/11?) on turning a deaf/turn
~~eyes~~ eyes to eyes on the Left."

267 Center "quite free of a leftward direction to policy
than of the emergence of a shift to the
right."

[Lamar is friendly to Unilateral Communion - vs. CPD
(But, Big? Bushy?)

No? 267

Under mining of GW?

(in BHO?)

Hillman

[I'm thinking: I should support Lamar:]

("like unilateral, unilateral with formal -
was further from left than from with unilateral
on Right")

so Center connected
for 50 years? (BHO?)
(SWAT)

R - mix - means - left
50 years mixed for unilateral? (No, unilateral?)

4 1961-68-66⁻⁶⁷ A dict regime "Humanitarian
interventions" i.e. (cover for) ^{US} empire!
Reagan

(Can & against "Com" in China? "US #1")
Is China "com"?

278 CPD: Iran (71) and Nicaragua (79) are US "interests"
SU "gains" "Who lost...?"

279 Can't Empire's offensive actions are "economically defensive"

COVER

(Protect (back of)

279.

knowing, function -
an even...

279: Blockade/attacks:

confront Oth with

Liberty, Western

"on a way of unacceptable

ambiguities

(misleading risks) gamblers,

not contented

(NOR EVEN "RISKS/PROB": AMBIGUITIES

279. CPD shipping list is (1979 (adapted by Carter))

MA [figure], B-1, Triant IV, (ALCMs? ~~and~~)

12? 260B for 5 years
on budget

MM improvement P-II N production
(+ draft!)

1-12-16 Don't go now (S&H: and Russia!)

(It doesn't require a mechanism/weapon to
make "threats of moral action"
and
omissible)

not all are attacks
could be omissible
(most of them, we NEED
marginally provided)

Eth bluff or "risk of loss of
control" (= moral strategy!)
can be effective!
(Both, dangerous!)

VN split Dem/Republicans

(and left was even confounding
anti-imperial.)

28(False view of SO mis (+ capabilities)

through most of 20 years (except N?!))

late Reagan
early Carter: body plan
USA

Bastards

CDM/CD

Nitze

Gunnalt

Murphy

JS says nothing of: ELK challenge Anderson?

Hostage Crisis

1980

Farrell Rail
(~~from~~ Crisis)

After SU War

2d Rail Pl

OCT. SURPRISE

285 PD-59 Confession: CDD proposed

"nuclear over-fights" — CF discrep.

(Simp habber just want her along her plan)

+ program — just as foresee of MAO

(like SWB's "FS/EU"?)

— Paper on SU strategy!

(Words right? Probably: some intense

as w/ USAF?)

Being not 1/10 cities

2/10 cheap?

Criticism of PD-59 was valid against me!

(or for SU?)

(Also — if plan suggests "good US FS" it

increases SU hypothesis of the conclusion (not in 62)

Agenda: We don't need a military buildup
any more than we did in 1979-80's.

1.6T

(Was that needed for Hardwood, end of SU?

or did it delay G?

1983 degree of disruption!

R = JFK in Berlin + Cuba!

Henry: "There are more important things than power ...
things our American should be willing to
fight for." 1-10-87

[FIGHT RUSSIA?!

MORE IMPORTANT THAN PEACE

WITH SU? (US WAR WITH SU?"

NO!

for greater now? SU "R drive for (united) Europe!"

(Butin: German

"let terror" vs. "human rights"
(SU!)

maintain
SU policy

SU source of all "terror"!

292 Wentworth: R will probe provision & stop at line (?)

TR

2-10-16

X || CLOC and Alfreding-Berl
both ignore the long source there -
what being "know" be known

+ role to effect
need - for US

(even, US beginning in
what groups)

CANDOR: Here is what going is (think of DDI*)
Here are efforts if it fails to enter

(an apparent, possible)

* on a rein-trojan to perpetuate attacks?
D-2, CF...